

***Remarks***

Claims 54-123 are pending in the application, with claims 54, 68, 78, 92 and 107 being the independent claims. Claims 54, 68, 78, 92 and 107 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the original claims and throughout the specification. Thus, no new matter is added by way of these amendments, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 54-123 were rejected as being unpatentable over Huo in view of Chenchik. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Establishing prima facie obviousness requires a showing that some combination of objective teachings in the prior art and/or knowledge available to one of skill in the art would have lead that individual to arrive at the claimed invention. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The presently claimed methods comprise a step of cleavage of one or more of synthesized cDNA complexes with an enzyme that cleaves at one or more cleavage sites within the primer-adapter, to release one or more cDNA molecules from the hapten.

Huo does not teach a method wherein cleavage of a restriction site within a primer-adaptor results in the release of synthesized cDNA from the hapten. Rather Huo uses restriction site cleavage to fill in the cut site of the second synthesized strand of DNA with biotinylated nucleotides. See Huo at column 13, lines 40-45. Likewise, the Chenchik reference does not teach the cleavage methods of the present claims. Thus, combining the cited references does not yield the claimed invention. The references fail to teach and/or suggest the claimed invention. *Prima facie* obviousness has not been established and Applicants therefore respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 20, 2007

/Natalie A. Davis/  
Natalie A. Davis  
Reg. No. 53,849  
Agent for Applicants

Invitrogen Corp.  
1600 Faraday Ave.  
Carlsbad, CA 92008  
(760) 268-7469